

**REMARKS**

The application comprises claims 1-38, 40-44, 46-47 and 57-62, of which claims 59-62 are rejected. Claims 1-38, 40-44, 46-47 and 57-58 are allowed. Claims 59 and 60 are currently amended. Claims 63-65 are cancelled.

**35 USC §101**

Claims 59 and 61-62 are rejected under 35 USC §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, Examiner has indicated that the claimed invention fails to produce a useful, concrete or tangible result.

As discussed in the telephone interview between the Examiner and the undersigned, the actions performed in the methods of claims 59, 61 and 62 are adapted to produce search results as a consequence of an input search query. Inherent in these computer-implemented methods is that these search results are eventually presented to the user who input the search query, for example on a display screen of the computer. It would not make sense to receive the query, manipulate data and then not present the results of the query. Therefore, a concrete, tangible and useful result is produced by providing, in response to a search query, relevant search results which are identified based at least in part on an analysis of their interconnectivity to other relevant results.

**35 USC §112**

Claims 59-62 are rejected under 35 USC §112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In view of the amendments included herein, Applicants respectfully disagree with Examiner, as all essential elements of the amended claims or their equivalents are described in the specification as filed.

**Regarding Claim 59:**

Second limitation- As discussed with the Examiner in the telephone conference, “cross-references” refers to the interconnectivity of a “hub” website with other websites. The Examiner indicated that the meaning of “cross-references” as it appears in the claims is unclear. Therefore, in order to provide additional clarity to claim 59, Applicants are deleting the word “cross” leaving instead only “references”. After amendment, the second limitation reads, “assigning relevance scores to the documents based on references between the documents within the initial set”.

Support for this limitation can be found on page 1, line 31 to page 2, line 1 of the application as filed where it states, “in an embodiment of the invention, the hubs or page lists are

selected by virtue of their including links to a significant number of the sites in the set of the input sites. An expected advantage of using hubs is that each hub may concentrate in it a large number of links to relevant sites, beyond those provided in the input set, and also include additional information which can help a human user select certain sites for browsing” and on pages 15-16, wherein exemplary algorithms are provided for assigning a relevance score to search results based on these references (see page 16, line 9 for how to calculate a total score for a search result).

Third limitation- Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s contention that “sorting the documents” is not described in the present application. As explained in the previous response, sorting is defined as arranging according to class, kind, or size; to classify; or to separate from others. As discussed in the telephone interview, Applicants are willing to clarify the meaning of “sorting the documents” by amending the claims to read “sorting by at least one of ranking, grouping or filtering.”

Methods described in the application provide sorting of search results or documents. In some embodiments of the invention, sorting is accomplished by: a) ranking search results; b) selecting some or all of these search results for further analysis (*e.g.* filtering); and/or c) grouping the results. This is described at page 9, line 31 to page 11, line 7.

Regarding Claim 60:

Third limitation- Please see the discussion pertaining to the second limitation of claim 59, regarding “cross references”. Claim 60 has been amended to delete the word “cross”.

Fourth limitation- Applicants disagree with the Examiner that there is no support in the specification for returning a set of relevant documents to a user, the set being sorted based on relevance scores. For example, page 1, line 33 to page 2, line 2 indicates that relevant documents are provided to a human user in order to assist the user in selecting sites. In addition, page 11, line 8 says that “filtered hubs are then presented to user 102 (136)”. This is shown in Fig. 2. Therefore, Applicants believe that there is ample support in the specification for the fourth limitation of claim 60.

Regarding Claim 61:

First limitation- “providing a search term” has support on page 3, lines 8-10 and page 9 line 31, *inter alia*.

Second limitation- a limited set of results indexed to the search term is returned, as described on page 9, lines 31-34. Line 34 in particular describes returning a limited set of results, for example limited to 50.

Third limitation- the third limitation of “generating a limited set of pages including links to said limited list and indexed to said search term” is described at least on page 10, lines 16-25. This portion of the application describes searching groups comprised of the limited results generated in the second limitation; the search is for links in one site to other sites in the limited results (see lines 16-17) and is necessarily indexed to the search term since this was the first limitation of the method (“providing a search term”).

Fourth limitation- Applicants disagree with the Examiner that there is no support in the specification for “generating a set of search results responsive to the number of links from said limited set to pages in said limited list”. Page 10, lines 22-30 describes collating and ranking search results which are ranked according to various factors including at least the number of links to the other search result sites (see 1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> limitations). In order to collate and rank search results, there have to be, of course, search results generated in the first place.

Regarding Claim 62:

The Examiner previously indicated that he could not find support in the specification for the limitation, “generating a limited set of pages comprises selecting pages including said search term.” Applicants respectfully disagree. This limitation is described on page 3, lines 8-10; page 9, lines 31-34 and page 9 line 31, *inter alia*.

35 USC §102(e)

Claims 59-62 are rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,421,675 to *Ryan, et al.* (“the ‘675 patent”). Applicants disagree with the Examiner that claims 59-62 are anticipated by the ‘675 patent because the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case for anticipation under §102(e).

Not all of the elements of claims 59-60 are described by the ‘675 patent. Claims 59 and 60 indicate that relevance scores are assigned to search results based on references between the results. In contrast, the portion of the ‘675 patent that the Examiner cited, col. 6, lines 12-16, indicates that relevance is determined by the web pages “relevance to the key word”. Further analysis of the ‘675 patent indicates that this “relevance to the key word” is determined by observing user behavior and tabulating a) the cumulative number of significant visits to each web site corresponding to each key word; b) the previous number of cumulative significant visits; and, c) a date time factor relating to the instant of the creation or input of each web page. Col. 12, lines 15-42. Nowhere in the ‘675 patent is it described or suggested that a measure of the references between search results is used in order to determine relevance. Therefore, claims 59 and 60 are not


anticipated by the '675 patent since search result relevance is determined differently (*i.e.* in the present claims: based on references between documents and in the '675 patent: by observing user behavior towards the results).

Regarding claims 61-62, the Examiner has not shown where in the '675 patent the step of: generating a set of search results responsive to the number of links from the limited set of pages to the limited list of results, is described. Instead, the Examiner has cited to col.1, lines 19-22 and 25-28 which is the Background section of the '675 patent and which does not describe in any way generating search result based on a number of links contained within the documents found. In fact, the portion to which the Examiner cites explicitly states that results are generated by scanning for the specific key word(s) entered by a user in web site addresses and web site text. Providing results based on the appearance of a particular key word and providing results based on a number of hyperlinks between the search results are two different concepts. As a result, claim 61 is not anticipated and neither is its dependent claim 62.

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, Applicants believe the claims are in a condition for allowance. Notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner is unable to agree that the claims are all patentable, he is respectfully requested to contact Maier Fenster at toll free 1 (877) 428-5468. This number connects directly to our office in Israel. Please note that Israel is 7 hours ahead of Washington, D.C. and that our work week is Sunday-Thursday.

Respectfully submitted,  
Moshe KOPPEL et al.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Todd A. SERBIN  
Reg. No. 45,087

September 28, 2006

William H. Dippert, Esq.  
Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen LLP  
250 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10177

Tel: (212) 986-1116